1	
2	
3	
4	
5	BEFORE THE PUBLIC DISCLOSURE COMMISSION
6	OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
7	IN THE MATTER OF ENFORCEMENT) ACTION AGAINST) PDC CASE NO.: 02-269
8	Gary Long, City Manager, City of Burien) STIPULATION OF FACTS AND VIOLATION
10	Respondent.
11	
12	Gary Long, City Manager of the City of Burien (Respondent) and Public Disclosure
13	Commission Enforcement Staff (Staff) jointly submit this Stipulation of Facts and Violation
14	for Commission consideration in lieu of a full enforcement hearing before the Commission.
15	The parties agree that pursuant to RCW 42.17.360 et. seq., the Commission has the authority to
16	accept, decline, or to suggest modifications to this Stipulation.
17	Facts
18	Both parties agree that the Report of Investigation dated February 8, 2002, and the
19	Brief Enforcement Hearing Memorandum dated February 11, 2002, contain accurate
20	statements of fact except as noted below. The Brief Enforcement Hearing Memorandum, the
21	-
22	Report of Investigation, and all exhibits are incorporated herein by this reference.
23	The background section of the Report of Investigation and Sections 4a and 4f of the
24	Brief Enforcement Hearing Memorandum should have stated that Initiative 747 would change
25	

1	all of the limitation factors on property tax levy increases to "101%." For taxing districts with
2	populations less than 10,000, the new limitation factor would be 101% of the highest of the
3	three previous annual levies. For the state, the new limitation factor would be the lower of
4	101% or the previous year's inflation rate. For other taxing districts, such as the City of
5	Burien, the limitation factor would be the lower of these two numbers, but if the inflation rate
7	is less than 1%, the City could increase its levy to the 101% level using the same special
8	procedure and declaration of special need as in existing law.
9	Violation
10	Respondent and Staff agree that based upon the facts stipulated above, the Respondent
11	committed a single violation of RCW 42.17.130. In acknowledging the violation, the
12	Respondent maintains that the violation was a result of innocent error.
13	
	Penalty
14	Penalty
	Penalty The parties are unable to jointly recommend an appropriate penalty for the
14	·
14 15	The parties are unable to jointly recommend an appropriate penalty for the
14 15 16 17 18	The parties are unable to jointly recommend an appropriate penalty for the Commission. Each party intends to present a brief oral argument before the Commission at the
14 15 16 17 18 19	The parties are unable to jointly recommend an appropriate penalty for the Commission. Each party intends to present a brief oral argument before the Commission at the meeting scheduled for May 21, 2002.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	The parties are unable to jointly recommend an appropriate penalty for the Commission. Each party intends to present a brief oral argument before the Commission at the meeting scheduled for May 21, 2002. Respondent agrees to comply in good faith with RCW 42.17.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	The parties are unable to jointly recommend an appropriate penalty for the Commission. Each party intends to present a brief oral argument before the Commission at the meeting scheduled for May 21, 2002. Respondent agrees to comply in good faith with RCW 42.17.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	The parties are unable to jointly recommend an appropriate penalty for the Commission. Each party intends to present a brief oral argument before the Commission at the meeting scheduled for May 21, 2002. Respondent agrees to comply in good faith with RCW 42.17. Respectfully submitted this 21 st day of May, 2002.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	The parties are unable to jointly recommend an appropriate penalty for the Commission. Each party intends to present a brief oral argument before the Commission at the meeting scheduled for May 21, 2002. Respondent agrees to comply in good faith with RCW 42.17. Respectfully submitted this 21 st day of May, 2002.